



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,368	02/26/2004	Norihisa Iga	Q80108	3409
23373	7590	03/16/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			LE, CANH	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2439	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,368	IGA, NORIHISA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CANH LE	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 14, 15, 25-30 and 40-55 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 16-24, 31-39, 55 and 56 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 14, 15, 25-30 and 40-55 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :06/12/2008; 02/20/2008;11/15/2006;02/26/2004.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 01/12/2009.

Claims 14-15, 25, 40, 46, and 50 have been amended.

Claims 1-3, 16-24, 31-39, and 55-56 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 14-15, 25-30, and 40-55 have been examined and are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment of the specifications and the drawings in the reply on 01/12/2009 is acknowledged.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 20-21, filed 01/12/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C.101 rejection of claims 14-15 and 40-50 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 14-15 and 40-50 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments, see page 21-22, filed 01/12/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claims 14-15 and 46 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claims 14-15 and 46 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments filed 01/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) “Abe fails to teach or suggest the personal computer 2 receiving a condition of the use of content from the portable telephone 1.”

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the following reasons:

Per (A):

Abe positively teaches receiving condition of the use of content from a mobile external device [Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”]; See also par. [0028-0029]].

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

(Claim 14, line 11): The device should replace by “the external device” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 25-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Satoshi Abe (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008.

As per claim 25:

Satoshi teaches a method for an external device to execute content, method comprising:

(a) receiving condition of the use of content from a mobile external device [Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”]; See also par. [0028-0029]].

(b) acquiring content from a content server [Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5; portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication server; fig. 3].

(c) executing content [Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software];

(c) terminating execution of content [Satoshi: par. [0032]; Software outside the portable telephone is deleted after the telephone is removed]; and

(d) deleting said condition of the use of content [**Satoshi: par. [0032]; Software outside the portable telephone is deleted after the telephone is removed**].

As per claim 26:

Satoshi further teaches the method as claimed in claim 25 further comprising the step of storing content before executing content [**Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software; fig. 3**].

As per claim 29:

Satoshi teaches the method as claimed in claim 25 further comprising the step of receiving command inputs [**Satoshi: figs. 1-3**];

As per claim 30:

Satoshi further teaches the method as claimed in claim 25 further comprising the step of searching other external devices for content [**Satoshi: fig. 4; par. [0033-0035]; LAN is connected between personal computer 2A and personal computer 2B. “The desired software is launched from the personal computer 2B”**];

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Hara** (US 20030058086 A1).

As per claim 14:

Satoshi teaches an external device for executing content, comprising

(a) communications section which communicates with a mobile information terminal

[Satoshi: figs. 1-3];

(b) a demand reception section which receives command inputs **[Satoshi: figs. 1-3];**

(c) a content management section which acquires content **[Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5;**

portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication server; fig. 3];

(d) a player which executes content **[Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software],**

(f) wherein the device receives a condition of the use of the content from the mobile information terminal **[Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license**

in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”; See also par. [0028-0029]].

Satoshi does not explicitly teach wherein during the execution of the content, the communications section checks an existence of the mobile information terminal in a neighborhood of the external device.

However, Hara teaches wherein during the execution of the content, the communications section checks an existence of the mobile information terminal in a neighborhood of the external device **[Hara: par. [0087], par. [0088]]**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi by including the teaching of Hara in order to solve problems concerning antennas and set a proper communication-possible range while suppressing an increase in power consumption and apparatus costs, thereby more enhancing the reliability of control or a convenience of a user **[Hara: par. [0017]]**.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Hara** (US 20030058086 A1) and further in view of **Hamada et al.** (JP 2002-163170).

As per claim 15:

Satoshi and Hara teach the subject matter as described as claim 14.

Satoshi and Hara do not explicitly teach the external device as claimed in claim 14, wherein acquiring the content further comprises acquiring content data corresponding to a performance of said external device.

However, Hamada teaches an external device, wherein acquiring the content further comprises acquiring content data corresponding to a performance of said external device

[Hamada: par. [0011], [0012]; claim 20].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi and Hara by including the teaching of Hamada because it would reduce work load on user by specifying the content regeneration terminal and provide data with respect to reproduction capability or the memory capability of regeneration terminal **[Hamada: par. [0001], [0011-0012]]**.

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Hori** et al. (US 2004/0010467 A1).

As per claim 27:

Satoshi does not explicitly teach a method further comprising the step of recognizing a mobile information terminal that has sent condition of the use of content.

However, Hori teaches a method further comprising the step of recognizing a mobile information terminal that has sent condition of the use of content **[Hori; par. [096]; “cellphone**

includes a content ID for the system to identify each content data, a license ID (i.e. ticket) which is an administrator code to identify when and to whom the license was issued, and a transaction ID which is code generated for each distribution session to identify each distribution session”; See also par. [0140-0141], [0146-0147]].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi by including the teaching of Hori because it would provide a data distribution system that can prevent distributed copyrighted data from being replicated without permission of the copyright owner, and a recording apparatus and reproduction apparatus used in such a data distribution system [Hori: par. [0008]].

As per claim 28:

Satoshi and Hori teach the subject matter as described in claim 27.

Hori further teaches the method as claimed in claim 27 further comprising the step of linking an identifier for a mobile information terminal with a ticket, storing said identifier and said ticket [Hori; par. [096]]; **“cellphone includes a content ID for the system to identify each content data, a license ID (i.e. ticket) which is an administrator code to identify when and to whom the license was issued, and a transaction ID which is code generated for each distribution session to identify each distribution session”; See also par. [0140-0141], [0146-0147]; par. [0107]; “license server 10 includes an information database 304 store a license ID...”].**

Claims 40, 42-44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) and further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757).

As per claim 40:

Satoshi teaches a program, implemented on a computer readable medium, for an external device to execute content performing the processes of:

(a) receiving condition of the use of content from a mobile information terminal

[Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”; See also par. [0028-0029]];

(b) receiving a demand to execute content from said mobile information terminal

[Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”; See also par. [0028-0029]];

(c) obtaining content [Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5; portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication server; fig. 3];

(d) executing content [Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software];

(g) deleting said condition of the use of content from a storage section [Satoshi: par. [0032]; Software outside the portable telephone is deleted after the telephone is removed].

Satoshi does not explicitly disclose a device which issues a content ID,

(e) receiving a demand to terminate the execution of content;

(f) terminating the execution of content; and

However, Yoshini teaches a content delivery system and content and content delivery method wherein the content delivery system issues content ID to a user [Yoshini: par. [0362], [0366], [0369], and [0372]; "a content ID identifying the content subject to the transaction, a ticket issuer ID identifying a ticket issuer which issues the ticket in response to the content transaction..."];

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the program for an external device of Satoshi by including the teaching of Yoshini in order to identify a purchased requested content from a user by using content ID [Yoshini: par. [0032]].

Satoshi and Yoshini do not explicitly teach,

(e) receiving a demand to terminate the execution of content;

(f) terminating the execution of content.

However, Shozo teaches,

(e) receiving a demand to terminate the execution of content [**Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7**];
(f) terminating the execution of content [**Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7**].
Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi and Yoshini by including the teaching of Shozo because it would provide a cellular phone and PHS which can be used as common remote control of two or more controlled instruments irrespective of a distance from an installation of a controlled instrument [**Shozo: par. [0017]**];

As per claim 42:

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 40 further performing the process of searching other external devices for the requested content [**Satoshi: fig. 4; par. [0033-0035]**];
LAN is connected between personal computer 2A and personal computer 2B. “The desired software is launched from the personal computer 2B”].

As per claim 43:

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 40 further performing the processes of:
(a) obtaining content from said mobile information terminal [**Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5**];
portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication

server; fig. 3, par. [0030]; “the desired software is downloaded to the memory or hard disk (HDD) of the personal computer 2, and thus usable”];

(b) storing said content in a storage section [Satoshi: fig. 3, par. [0030]; “the desired software is downloaded to the memory or hard disk (HDD) of the personal computer 2, and thus usable”].

As per claim 44:

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 40 further performing the processes of:

(a) obtaining content from a content server [Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5; portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication server; fig. 3];

(b) storing the content in a storage section [Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software].

As per claim 48:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 40.

Shozo further teaches the program as claimed in claim 40 further performing the processes of:

(a) receiving a demand from said mobile information terminal [Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7]; and

(b) stopping a content player [Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7].

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) and further in view of **Isamu Iwamoto** (JP-2002-024178).

As per claim 45:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 44.

Yoshini further teaches referring to said content ID and obtaining content [**Yoshini: par. [0362], [0366], [0369], and [0372]**]; "**a content ID identifying the content subject to the transaction, a ticket issuer ID identifying a ticket issuer which issues the ticket in response to the content transaction..."**].

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo do not explicitly disclose referring to a content server address and communicating with a content server.

However, Isamu teaches referring to a content server address and communicating with a content server [**Isamu: par. [0017]**]; "**each intrinsic identification code is located to the content server 1, license server2, and image display terminal 3. The identification code for example, is constituted by an IP (Internet Protocol) address**"]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi , Yoshini, and Shozo by including the teaching of Isamu because it would provide a content authentication and a content authentication

method for utilizing a content while preventing a disordered duplicate of the content [**Isamu: par. [0005]**].

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) and further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) and further in view of **Hara** (US 20030058086 A1).

As per claim 41:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 40.

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo do not explicitly teach a program further performing the process of periodically checking the existence of said mobile information terminal in neighborhood.

However, Hara teaches a program performing a process of periodically checking the existence of said mobile information terminal in neighborhood [**Hara: par. [0087], par. [0088]**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Yoshini and Shozo by including the teaching of Hara in order to solve problems concerning antennas and set a proper communication-possible range while suppressing an increase in power consumption and apparatus costs, thereby more enhancing the reliability of control or a convenience of a user [**Hara: par. [0017]**].

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) and further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) and further in view of **Hamada et al.** (JP 2002-163170).

As per claim 46:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 40.

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo do not explicitly teach a program performing the process of selecting content matching with a performance of a hardware on which said content is executed.

However, Hamada teaches a program performing the process of selecting content matching with the performance of a hardware on which said content is executed [**Hamada: par. [0011], [0012]; claim 20**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo by including the teaching of Hamada because it would reduce work load on user by specifying the content regeneration terminal and provide data with respect to reproduction capability or the memory capability of regeneration terminal [**Hamada: par. [0001], [0011-0012]**].

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) and further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) and further in view of **Safadi** (US 2003/0126086 A1).

As per claim 49:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 40.

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo do not explicitly teach a program performing the processes of:

- (a) confirming that said condition of the use of content is fulfilled; and
- (b) stopping a content player.

However, Safadi teaches,

(a) confirming that said condition of the use of content is fulfilled [Safadi: par. [0010];

“Associated access rights may have time based expiration of content usage or limit the number of plays”]; and

(b) stopping a content player [Safadi: par. [0010]; Safadi: par. [0010]; **“Associated access rights may have time based expiration of content usage or limit the number of plays”**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo by including the teaching of Safadi because it would secure a sale of content and protect against and unauthorized distribution and playback of the content [Safadi: par. [0002]].

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Yoshini et al.** (US 2002/0099663 A1) and further in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) and further in view of **Candelore** (US 7,120,250 B2).

As per claim 47:

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo teach the subject matter as described in claim 40.

Yoshini further teaches (a) storing an identifier of a mobile information terminal linked with a ticket [Yoshini: par. [0362], [0366], [0369], and [0372]; **"a content ID identifying the content subject to the transaction, a ticket issuer ID identifying a ticket issuer which issues the ticket in response to the content transaction..."**; fig. 39].

Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo do not explicitly teach a program performing the processes of:

- (b) decoding content;
- (c) confirming the validity of condition of the use of content; and
- (d) booting a content player.

However, Cadelore teaches a program performing the processes of:

- (b) decoding content [Cadelore: fig. 7, Col. 8, lines 40-48; decoder/encoder];
- (c) confirming the validity of condition of the use of content [Cadelore: Col. 7, lines 55-65; Col. 8, lines 12-13; determining that valid digital right are available from the DRM data; fig. 7, Col. 8, lines 40-48; DRM validator;]; and
- (d) booting a content player [Cadelore: fig. 7, play content (box 750); Col. 7, lines 55-65].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Yoshini, and Shozo by including the teaching of Cadelore to provide users with a means for multiple encrypting digitized video for

purpose of enabling multiple digital rights management scenarios (DRMs) [Candelore: Col 1. , lines 45-51].

Claims 50 and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) in view of **Saisei Sochi** (JP 2002-175084) Translated by Schreiber Translations, Inc, June 2008 and further in view of **Burger** (US 2007/0027696 A1).

As per claim 50:

Satoshi teaches a program, implemented on a computer readable medium, for an external device to execute content performing the processes of:

(b) receiving a ticket and condition of the use of content including an identifier of said mobile information terminal [Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”]; See also par. [0028-0029]].

(c) storing said condition of the use of content in a memory [Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7;

“software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”; See also par. [0028-0029]

(d) acquiring content from a content server [Satoshi: par. [0037], fig. 5; portable telephone is able to download a software usage license from the authentication server; fig. 3].

(e) executing content [Satoshi: par. [0027], [0030], fig. 8; a personal computer downloads software which one wishes to use the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2 and thus made usable; par. [0039]; music data and video data can be used as the software];

Satoshi does not explicitly teach,

(f) terminating the execution of content,

(g) renewing said ticket,

(a) sending an identifier of said external device to a mobile information terminal.

However, Shozo teaches,

(f) terminating the execution of content [Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi by including the teaching of Shozo because it would provide a cellular phone and PHS which can be used as common remote control of two or more controlled instruments irrespective of a distance from an installation of a controlled instrument [Shozo: par. [0017]].

Satoshi and Shozo do not explicitly teach,

- (g) renewing said ticket,
- (a) sending an identifier of said external device to a mobile information terminal.

However, Saisei teaches,

(g) renewing said ticket **[Saisei: par. [0058]; “...The access restriction ACm is specially restriction information used on an occasion for outputting a license or license key from memory card to an external destination and includes the permitted number of play back occasion (i.e. number occasions for outputting the license key for playback)...”;** par. [0062]; **“the update of the certification revocation list is essential judged by using, as standard, the date of disseminations of a license (e.g. license key) ...”;** See also par. [0064], [0115-0117], [0121].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi and Shozo by including the teaching of Saisei because it would provide a playback device capable of playing back encrypted contents data in a manner similar to that for playing back ordinary contents data **[Saisei: par. [0015]]**.

Satoshi, Shozo, and Saisei do not explicitly teach sending an identifier of said external device to a mobile information terminal.

However, Burger teaches sending an identifier of said external device to a mobile information terminal **[Burger: par. [0026]; the device #2506 (PDA) may received an ID from device #1052].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Shozo, and Saisei by including the

teaching of Burger because it would provide for third party control of a device, allows for viewer controller separation and authentication with validation **[Burger par. [0019]].**

As per claim 52:

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger teach the subject matter as described as claim 50.

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 50 further performing the process of storing content data in a memory **[Satoshi: fig. 3, par. [0030]; “the desired software is downloaded to the memory or hard disk (HDD) of the personal computer 2, and thus usable”].**

As per claim 53:

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger teach the subject matter as described as claim 50.

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 50 further performing the process of storing said identifier linked with said ticket in a memory **[Satoshi: par. [0023]; fig. 3, par. [0037], fig. 5; “software usage license in the portable telephone or the upgrading action of the software is accompanied by a maintenance contract, the upgrading license or the software itself are downloaded through the portable telephone”; par. [0027], fig. 7; “software usage license in the memory of the portable telephone is present and the software is present in the memory or hard disk of the personal computer 2, it becomes usable (step S73)”;** See also par. **[0028-0029]].**

As per claim 54:

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger teach the subject matter as described as claim 50.

Shozo further teaches the program as claimed in claim 50 further performing the process of receiving command inputs [**Shozo: par. [0007], [0008], [0010], figs 1-7**].

As per claim 55:

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger teach the subject matter as described as claim 50.

Satoshi further teaches the program as claimed in claim 50 further performing the process of searching other external devices for the requested content [**Satoshi: fig. 4; par. [0033-0035]**]; **LAN is connected between personal computer 2A and personal computer 2B. “The desired software is launched from the personal computer 2B”**].

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Satoshi Abe** (JP 2001-273135) Translated by FLS, Inc June 2008 in view of **Shozo Toritani** (JP H11-284757) in view of **Saisei Sochi** (JP 2002-175084) Translated by Schreiber Translations, Inc, June 2008 and further in view of **Burger** (US 2007/0027696 A1) and further in view of **Hara** (US 20030058086 A1).

As per claim 51:

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger teach the subject matter as described as claim 50.

Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger do not explicitly teach a program further performing the process of checking in neighborhood the existence of said mobile information terminal identified by said identifier.

However, Hara teaches a process of checking in neighborhood the existence of said mobile information terminal identified by said identifier **[Hara: par. [0087], par. [0088]]**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Satoshi, Shozo, Saisei, and Burger by including the teaching of Hara in order to solve problems concerning antennas and set a proper communication-possible range while suppressing an increase in power consumption and apparatus costs, thereby more enhancing the reliability of control or a convenience of a user **[Hara: par. [0017]]**.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zand Kambiz can be reached on 571-272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Le/

Examiner, Art Unit 2439

March 13, 2009

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434